



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

368

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/228,872 01/11/99 BARRY

M TRSY-23.677

GREGORY M HOWISON  
THOMPSON AND HOWISON  
P O BOX 741715  
DALLAS TX 75374-1715

WM31/1205

EXAMINER

WALLERSON, M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED:

12/05/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/228,872

Applicant(s)

Barry et al

Examiner

Mark Wallerson

Group Art Unit

2622



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Sep 12, 2000

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 5-27 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 5-13, 15-23, and 25-27 is/are rejected.

☒ Claim(s) 14 and 24 is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2622

**Part III DETAILED ACTION**

*Notice to Applicant(s)*

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: amendment filed on 9/12/2000.

2. This application has been reconsidered. Claims 5-27 are pending.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry et. al. (hereinafter referred to as Barry) (U. S. 5,596,416) in view of Matias (U. S. 5,528,374).

With respect to claims 5, 7, and 18, Barry discloses a multiple print engine (column 1, lines 56-57) for printing one or more copies (files) of a multiple page document (column 1, lines 57-63) input as a single print job (column 1, lines 63-65) comprising a plurality of physical print engines (10) each having an input for rasterized data, and an output bin (23) for receiving printed output pages; a job distributor (30) for receiving multiple page documents (column 3, lines 22-25)

Art Unit: 2622

and providing the rasterized page data for parallel distribution to the inputs of the plural physical print engines (column 3, lines 35-55) according to print job parameters associated with the rasterized data (column 3, lines 39-42). Barry differs from claims 5, 7, and 18 in that he does not disclose that the job distributor has a single RIP engine (processor). Matias discloses a printing apparatus in which a single RIP (16) processes jobs for plural print engines (figure 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Barry wherein a single RIP would be used. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Barry by the teaching of Matias in order to simplify the printing process.

Further with respect to claim 18, Barry discloses an image task manager for retrieving the rasterized image for the print job and determining a print order for each page according to print job parameters (column 6, lines 50-59), and an engine manager (130) for selecting one of the print engines to print. each image (column 6, line 60 to column 7, line 3).

Further with respect to claim 7, Barry discloses a storage device for storing each rasterized image (149); an image task manager for retrieving the rasterized image for the print job and determining a print order for each page according to print job parameters (column 6, lines 50-59), and an engine manager (130) for selecting one of the print engines to print. each image (column 6, line 60 to column 7, line 3).

Art Unit: 2622

With regard to claims 6 and 19, Barry discloses that the print engine comprises an electrophotographic print engine having an interface circuit coupled to the input (column 6, lines 12-15).

With respect to claim 8, Barry discloses the job parameters associated with the rasterized images comprises information encoded in the rasterized page data and information entered by the user (column 3, lines 17-25 and 36-39 and column 7, line 67 to column 8, line 14).

With regard to claim 9, Barry discloses the encoded information includes printing control information (column 9, lines 28-36).

With respect to claims 10 and 20, Barry differs from claim 10 in that he does not a RIP engine Matias discloses a decoder (42) for decoding input print strings; a rasterizer (46) for generating a rasterized image mapped to the input print data (column 4, lines 15-38), a formatter (46) for constituting each image as a page of data (column 4, lines 15-38), and a storage (149) for storing each rasterized image. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Barry by the teaching of Matias in order to improve the image processing.

With regard to claims 11 and 21, Barry discloses page buffers for storing rasterized page data (149, figure 5).

With respect to claims 12 and 22, Barry discloses a disassembler (120) for extracting print job parameters from the rasterized page data, and an arranger (126) for arranging the print order for each print job (column 6, line 60 to column 7, line 3).

Art Unit: 2622

With respect to claims 13, 23, and 26, Barry discloses routing rasterized images directly to the print engine (column 7, lines 4-19).

With respect to claims 15 and 25, Barry discloses a selector (120) for associating one of the engines with each rasterized data (column 7, lines 4-19).

With regard to claim 16, Barry discloses that the rasterized images have associated print characteristics for the print job such that the manager is operable to control the selected print engine independent of information encoded in the images (column 7, lines 13-19 and column 9, lines 28-36).

With respect to claims 17 and 27, Barry discloses sending data to at least two print engines at the same time (column 10, lines 49-50).

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 14 and 24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 9/12/00 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant submits that neither Barry or Mathias discloses distributing the pages after RIPing. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Mathias discloses that a job or different jobs may

Art Unit: 2622

be routed to multiple print engines after being processed by an RIP (column 6, lines 51-62 and column 4, lines 45-48).

*Conclusion*

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Wallerson whose telephone number is (703) 305-8581.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Any response to this action should be mailed to: -

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051 (for formal communications intended for entry)

(703) 308-9589 (for informal or draft communications, such as proposed amendments to be discussed at an interview; please label such communications "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Application/Control Number: 09/228,872

Page 7


Art Unit: 2622

or hand-carried to:

Crystal Park Two  
2121 Crystal Drive  
Arlington, VA.  
Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

  
MARK WALLERSON  
PATENT EXAMINER

Mark Wallerson

  
EDWARD COLES, SR.  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 2622